

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Final Evaluation of the “Strengthening the Resilience of Communities through Community-Based Disaster Risk Management” (CBDRM project)

<b>Location</b>	- Home based - DPRK: Pyongyang and CBDRM project areas: ✓ Yonsan (3 Ris) and Singye (8 Ris) Counties, North Hwanghae Province; ✓ Yangdok County (4 Ris), South Pyongan Province
<b>Application deadline</b>	24 September 2019
<b>Type of Contract</b>	Individual Contractor
<b>Post Level</b>	International Consultant
<b>Languages required:</b>	English
<b>Duration of Initial Contract:</b>	Total 25 working days (including 7 working days in DPRK)

#### BACKGROUND

##### **Briefly describe the project rationale / background and the objectives of the project**

##### **About the project:**

The occurrences of extreme weather events and seasonal variability are one of the key contributors to loss in livelihoods, increase in poverty and significant threat to human development in rural areas in Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK). The causes of flood, landslides and droughts in the country are not limited to weather and climate conditions. In most of the rural areas, forest ecosystems have been converted into agricultural land in order to overcome food shortages and trees have been cut down as the primary source of household level energy. The destruction of DPRK’s forests contributed significantly to serious damage when impacted by natural hazards, especially, flooding, and landslides since deforestation weakens nature’s buffering ability to store water. Currently, there is a large gap in capacities at all levels to cope with the impact of disasters and to improve communities’ responsiveness and resilience. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) noted recent improvements in disaster preparedness and increased attention at national level to address the underlying factors that contribute to risks, against the backdrop of development priorities that focus on environmental protection and water conservation. CBDRM project will help local level communities acquire knowledge of successful practices in Community-based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) processes, timely and appropriate risk information and access to early warning, develop coping skills as well as access resources and services for disaster risk reduction actions that offer development benefits in near term as well as reductions in vulnerability over the long term.

*The project’s objective* is to enhance vulnerable communities’ resilience to natural hazards. This will be achieved through CBDRM approaches, the project aims to support social resilience, whereby people can identify and anticipate risks, plan and act collectively, and can marshal their individual capabilities to overcome threats and shocks. The effects of disasters when they occur can further be lessened through preparedness and recovery efforts that can also leave communities more resilient. Such resilience is not only critical to contribute towards greater progress in human development, but also to ensure sustainable progress over time.

*UNDP’s strategy* for community-based disaster risk management is to focus its efforts at the local (Ri) level. The CBDRM approaches will promote and support actions initially in the target areas, that range from incremental steps to the introduction of entirely new community and household-level practices that are important for reducing risks from recurring climate extremes and future climate scenarios. It is

intended to enhance local capacities so that community members, including women and youth, are key important stakeholders in risk reduction and recovery.

*Key Outputs:*

- Output 1: Ri level rural communities are provided with skills and resources enabling them to implement community-based disaster risk management measures.
- Output 2: Mechanisms, Guidelines and Procedures for promoting CBDRM are developed and implemented at local (Ri) level. Further, the project will strengthen selected communities' capacities for participatory hazard mapping and disaster reduction.

**Management structure and stakeholders for the project:**

Adopting a direct implementation modality (DIM), the project has its dedicated management team based in the UNDP CO. An International Project Manager responsible for the daily management of the project with assistance from national project staff and consultant was recruited.

A Project Steering Committee was formed for guiding the project direction and addressing challenges, co-chaired by the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative (DRR) and the National Coordinator from the DPRK National Coordinating Committee (NCC) for UNDP, with participation of representatives from the Line Ministries and other institutions as needed at the central level.

## EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND SAMPLE QUESTIONS

**Purpose and scope of evaluation:**

The project conducted a Mid-Term-Review in 2018 to assess its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and recommend specific measure for further improvement of project implementation including solutions for overcoming the challenges.

The project document also requires a *“Terminal Evaluation, to be conducted by an independent third party, will be initiated at the end of the Project and involve consultation with the Project stakeholders at the national and local levels”*. It further outlines that the *“Terminal Evaluation will detail the achievements, outcomes & impacts of the project compared to baseline, the issues faced, and lessons learned during the project implementation and will provide recommendations for future actions”*.

Therefore, this Terms of Reference (ToR) outlines the conduct of the Final Evaluation of the CBDRM project. The international consultant to be recruited will need to review the entire duration of project implementation (October 2015 to December 2019), focusing on project results and experiences as well as key challenges met, lessons learnt, and areas for improvement, through the lenses of relevance, efficiency, national ownership, effectiveness and sustainability. The consultant will also take into consideration issues of gender, human rights and leaving no one behind. This will lead to recommendations of areas and methods of possible future interventions for the DPRK.

**Evaluation questions:**

The mainstream definitions of the OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in terms of human rights and gender dimensions which need to be added into the evaluation criteria chosen (link [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#))

- **Relevance:**
  - To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the CPD outputs, CPD outcomes, UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
  - To what extent does the project contribute to the Theory of Change for the relevant CPD outcome?
  - To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?

- To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?
- **Effectiveness:**
  - To what extent did the project contribute to the CPD outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
  - To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
  - What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
  - To what extent has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?
  - What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
  - In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
  - In which areas does the project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they or could they be overcome?
  - What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
  - Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical, and feasible within its frame?
  - To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
  - To what extent is project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
  - To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
  - To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?
- **Efficiency:**
  - To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the Project Document efficient in generating the expected results?
  - To what extent has UNDP's project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
  - To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
  - To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
  - To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
  - To what extent do the monitoring and evaluation systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
- **Sustainability:**
  - Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
  - To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
  - Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to CPD outputs and CPD outcomes?
  - Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
  - To what extent did UNDP actions pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outputs?
  - What is the risk that the level of stakeholder's ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?

- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures, and policies exist to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development by primary stakeholders?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

**Evaluation crosscutting issues sample questions:**

• **Human rights:**

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from UNDP DPRK's work in contributing to enhance fulfillment of people's economic and social right

• **Gender equity:**

- To what extent has gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

**DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

**Expected Outputs and Deliverables**

**Methodology:**

The evaluation will be guided by the updated UNDP evaluation policy building on its global practices (Programme and Project Operating Procedures). Following this TOR by the UNDP DPRK Country Office, the international consultant should,

*Before the field mission to DPRK*

- Conduct an extensive project related document review, based on which prepare a draft Inception Report with detailed evaluation methodology proposed such as Key Informant Interviews (KII), Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and other effective ways as appropriate to capture perceptions and evidence from both the key stakeholders at central level and the beneficiaries at the community level in the project areas, utilizing quantitative and qualitative mixed-methods.
- Finalize the Inception Report integrating comments and suggestions from UNDP and national counterparts.

*During the field mission in DPRK*

- Conduct field assessment applying the methodologies as per the Inception Report.
- Organize a validation / debriefing meeting with relevant key government counterparts and UNDP, to test the assumptions, findings, and recommendations, covering achievement and experiences, challenges and lessons, future improvement in possible continuation and / or replication.

*After the filed mission in DPRK*

- Utilize high quality info-graphics and other means in communicating the data and findings in the final report.
- Illustrate the extent to which the design and implementation of the project incorporate a gender equality perspective and human rights-based approach.
- Adopt an evidence-based approach underpinned by observations and especially data collected in findings provided, conclusions drawn, and recommendations made.

**Methodologies may include some or all of the following:**

- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- Review of all relevant documentation including:

- UN Strategic Framework DPRK 2011-2016
- UN Strategic Framework DPRK 2017-2021
- UNDP Country Programme Document DPRK 2011-2015
- UNDP DPRK quarterly programme monitoring and oversight reports
- Project Document including theory of change and results framework
- Annual Work Plans
- Quarterly and Annual Reports
- Project Steering Committee meeting minutes
- Field monitoring and visit reports
- MTR report 2018
- UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- Technical/Financial Monitoring Reports
- Other reports and materials produced by the project
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UNCT members, and implementing partners:
  - Development of questionnaires assessing relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability through interviewing different stakeholders.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- Field visits and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- Participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the evaluation managers, relevant stakeholders and direct beneficiaries.
- Data review and analysis of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
  - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use, the consultant will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

**Deliverables:**

- *Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages)*: the inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with UNDP CO, desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to field mission in DPRK.
- *Evaluation debriefings*: before leaving DPRK, UNDP will hold a preliminary debrief and findings with the consultant.
- *Evaluation matrix*<sup>1</sup>:  
Sample Evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods/Tools	Indicators/ Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis

- *Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length)*<sup>2</sup>: UNDP CO will review the draft evaluation report, coordinate inputs from relevant stakeholders and provide an amalgamated set of comments to the consultant within two weeks.
- *Final evaluation report with a stand-alone Executive Summary*: final editing to be completed within two weeks by the consultant with incorporation of comments received. For the purpose of *evaluation report*

<sup>1</sup> The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

<sup>2</sup> 40 to 60 pages including executive summary is suggested

*audit trail*, changes by the consultant in response to the draft report should be retained by the consultant to show how s/he has addressed comments.

### **Evaluation ethics**

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'<sup>3</sup>

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The Consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on its data. The Consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

The Consultant is expected to read carefully, understand and sign the 'Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System', which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

### **Institutional Arrangement**

- UNDP ensures the participation of key stakeholders and beneficiaries through meetings, discussions and sharing of evaluation report.
- UNDP Evaluation Commissioner/Owner (RR a.i / DRR a.i) as advisory body will provide a sounding board for the international consultant while protecting his/her independence and ensure UNDP's ownership of the report's findings and recommendations.
- UNDP Evaluation Manager (M&ES) and Programme Manager (Programme Analyst) will support the conduct of the evaluation, including provision of feedback to the inception report, participation in the validation meeting, provision and coordination for comments on the draft report, distribution of the final report, and initiation of the recommendations' implementation.
- UNDP Programme Manager will be responsible for facilitating the provision of the existing data / documents to the international consultant and field data collection in DPRK, including preparation of field assessment schedules and logistic coordination.
- The international consultant will work independently.
- Detailed arrangements including service days and schedule of payments will be defined in UNDP's contract with the recruited Individual Consultant.
- UNDP Evaluation Commissioner/Owner will approve the final evaluation report.

### **Duration of the Work**

The estimated duration of the assignment is 25 working days during November/December 2019. The whole process will be completed with the final report submitted and approved by 31 December 2019.

The tentative key stages of evaluation include:

- Phase 1 – Consultant selection: by 4 October 2019.
- Phase 2 - Desk review and inception report: during October/November 2019 (5 consultancy/working days)
- Phase 3 - Data collection/field mission in DPRK: 4 to 13 December 2019 (7 consultancy/working days)
- Phase 4 - Draft and finalization of report (incl. an executive summary): final report by 31 December 2019 (13 consultancy/working days)

<sup>3</sup> UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008: <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>

### **Duty Station**

- During mission in the DPRK, the Consultant will be based in Pyongyang, but with at least 2-3 days of field trips to the selected sites in the project areas (Yonsan and Singye Counties, North Hwanghae Province and Yangdok County, South Pyongan Province).

### **COMPETENCIES**

- Strong facilitation, communication, presentation skills.
- Strong analytical abilities and reporting skills, with openness to change responding to feedbacks received.
- Ability to plan, organize and implement work, including under pressure and tight deadlines.
- Proficiency in the use of IT facilities including office applications and also networks in conducting research.
- Demonstrates integrity and ethical standards.
- Displays cultural, gender, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

### **REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

#### **Educational Qualifications:**

- At least master's degree in economics, development or other related fields

#### **Experience**

- At least 8 years of demonstrable experience in development project assessment/evaluation
- Experience in dealing with government agencies at different levels, international organizations, and community people
- Understanding of socialist planned economy is a great asset
- Prior work experience with international organizations in DPRK or other countries in Asia Pacific region is desirable

#### **Language requirements**

- Excellent communication, presentation and writing skills in English

#### **Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments**

The candidates who feel interested in the assignment must send a financial proposal at **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be itemized covering all costs required to perform the tasks identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance and any other applicable cost to be incurred. The contract price will be output-based regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be made upon completion of the deliverables/outputs as per below percentages:

- *Deliverables - phase 1:* 40% of total contract amount
  - Desk Review, Inception Report and Evaluation matrix produced, submitted to and cleared by UNDP DPRK Country Office
  - Evaluation debriefing conducted with relevant stake-holders before leaving DPR Korea
- *Deliverables - phase 2:* 60% of total contract amount
  - Draft Evaluation Report submitted to UNDP for review and comments and acknowledged by UNDP DPRK CO
  - Final Evaluation Report incl. Executive summary incorporating comments received and approved by UNDP DPRK CO

## Evaluation Method and Criteria

The candidates will be evaluated based on the *cumulative analysis* methodology.

The award of the contract shall be made to the candidate whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%) and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

### Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 70 points):

- Criteria 1: Education – Max 10 points (10 pts – PhD degree; 5 pts – Master’s degree)
- Criteria 2: Relevant professional experience - Max 20 Points (20 pts – above 12 years; 15 pts – 10 to 12 years; 10 pts – 8 to 10 years);
- Criteria 3: Language skills – Max 5 points (5pts - native English speaker)
- Criteria 4: Knowledge and experience about DPRK – Max 10 points (10 pts - work or consultancy experience in DPRK; 5pts – experience in other Asia Pacific countries)
- Criteria 5: Proposed methodology to undertake the assignment – Max 25 Points (25 pts – fully understand the task, logical and reachable; 15 pts - get sense of the task, basically meet the requirement; 5 pts – rough and unclear)

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

### Documentation required

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into one (1) single PDF document as follows:

- Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability using the template provided in Annex II.
- Personal CV or [P11](#), indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- Technical proposal, including a) a brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment; and b) a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- Financial proposal, as per template provided in Annex II.

Incomplete proposals may not be considered.

### Annexes

- Annex I - [Individual IC General Terms and Conditions](#)
- Annex II - [Offeror’s Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual IC, including Financial Proposal Template](#)
- Annex III - <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/PDF/section-6.pdf>

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to [operations.dprk@undp.org](mailto:operations.dprk@undp.org)